Proceeding: IN THE MATTER-OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS RELAY SERVICES AND SPE 🔟 Record 1 of 2 Applicant Name: Augusta Goldstern Author Name: 'Augusta Goldstein oceeding Name: 98-67 Lawfirm Name: Contact Email: aagus@earthlink net Contact Name: **DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL** Address Line I- 15431 California #1 Address Line 2: State: CA 🔟 City: San Francisco Zip Code: 94118 Postal Code: Submission Status: ACCEPTED J Viewing Status: UNRESTRICTED Submission Type: CO Subject: File Number: Exparte Late Filed: DA Number: Calendar Date Filed: 07/26/1998 1:10:46 AM Date Disseminated Filed From EMAIL Official Date Filed: 07/27/1998 Confirmation # Proceeding: IN THE MATTER-OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS RELAY SERVICES AND SPE R.co,d 2 of 2 Applicant Name: Augusta Goldstein Proceeding Name 98-67 Author Name: Augusta Goldstein Lawfirm Name Contact Email: aagus@earthlink net Contact Name. Address Line 1: 5431 California #1 Address Line 2: State: C A 🔟 City: 'San Francisco Zip Code: 94 118 Postal Code: Submisston Status: ACCEPTED . Viewing Status: 'UNRESTRICTED 1 ubmission Type: CO Subject: File Number: Exparte Late Filed: DA Number: Calendar Date Filed: 07/25/199811:50:32 PM Date Disseminated Official Date Filed: 07/27/1998 Filed From EMAIL Confirmation #

INTERNET FLING

7/27/98

COMMENTS ON THE STS NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING - Revised 7/5/98

(PLEASE ACCEPT THE FOLLOWING LATE COMMENTS. WHEN THEY WERE SUBMITTED PREVIOUSLY-AND ON TIME-THE SYSTEM REJECTED THEM AND RETURNED THEM TO ME WHILE I WAS ON VACATION. THANK YOU. 7/25.38)

I am making these comments as an occasional user of Speech-to-Speech (STS). I have used it to communicate with a speech disabled friend, as well as with my own mother when I was myself temporarily speech disabled. The service is invaluable.

REGULATORY ISSUES - GENERAL

- 1. Many consumers and potential consumers wiii be unable to respond to this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) because of the nature of their multiple disabilities. Please do not take the lack of response as a lack of interest.
- 2. Text Telephones (TTYs) have been the standard technology for improving communication for the deaf, formerly the only community recognized as needing assistance in telephone communication. It is important to recognize that there are other speech disabled people for whom TTY service is not applicable. For these people, STS is (or could become) an essential technology. STS should be required nationally even though it does no? utilize the standard technology, TTYs. I support the California Public Utilities

 Commission (CPUC) position that the specific reference to TTYs in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) "...is meant to illustrate the type of technology that might be used, not to preclude the use of other-technologies."

Title IV of the ADA is applicable to any wire or radio communication service that enables persons with hearing or speech disabilities to engage in communication with persons without such disabilities and is not limited to services using TTYs.

3. Regarding the specifics of how STS should most effectively be implemented I refer you to the communication you have received from Bob Segalman in this regard. I hope you will study it with care and come to the same conclusion that I have: that STS should be implemented nationwide so that the speech disabled of this country can live their lives with greater ease and hope to conduct their lives and business with the same advantages that are enjoyed by those who are not speech disabled. That is, after all, the intent of the ADA.

Sincerely, Augusta Goldstein